

Washington County School District
Performance-based Compensation Program Proposal

Submitted to the USOE School Board

June 22, 2008

Washington County School District

Performance-based Compensation Program Proposal

Washington County School District (WCSD) proposes a one-time performance-based incentive program for School Year 2008-2009, which aligns with district and school level goals, supports existing district initiatives and builds on incentive programs piloted in the 2007-2008 school year. This proposal acknowledges and rewards both student achievement gains and the implementation of instructional practices that lead to those gains. WCSD's Professional Learning Community (PLC) Implementation Incentive program provides a system for individual, team and school-wide financial incentives for educators who demonstrate implementation of best practices proven to result in increased student achievement. These practices include team-based planning and assessment, as well as individual use of research-based teaching practices identified in each school's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). It is designed to encourage principals—as instructional leaders—to thoughtfully integrate these elements into their current CSIP, teacher evaluation practices and school-wide involvement efforts. The performance-based compensation program is based on a combination of individual, team, and school-based performance and is designed with the potential to include all certified educators, school administrators and site-based classified personnel who are directly involved in instruction through five levels of measured results:

- Level 1 Team Collaboration
- Level 2 Implementation of Instructional Practices
- Level 3 Student Achievement
- Level 4 Leadership
- Level 5 School-wide Improvement

The first level, **Team Collaboration**, rewards effective grade or content-area teams of teachers who work together to analyze student data, set measurable goals, define and deliver a consistent curriculum, formatively assess students progress, and design interventions to meet specific needs. The second level, **Implementation of Instructional Practices**, builds on the work of the team with targeted emphasis on individual, in-class implementation of specific teaching practices that will help the team achieve their goals for student learning. The targeted teaching practices will be selected by principals in consultation with district specialists/coordinators and will be based on each school's student achievement goals as stated in their CSIP. A strong component of Level 2 is the use of frequent and rigorous observations of instructional practice conducted by principals, staff developers and district specialists, using detailed observation tools provided by district specialists/coordinators.

The third level, **Student Achievement**, directly targets measurable student results. Teams will use state and district-approved tools to demonstrate their combined gains in student achievement that stem from improved collaboration (Level 1) and effective classroom practice (Level 2). Those teams whose students reach the targeted gains will qualify for the full, Level 3 performance incentive. The fourth level, **Leadership**, recognizes the impact and importance of effective leadership practices on student achievement. It provides incentives for team leaders, principals and staff developers for each team that collaborates successfully and reaches their student achievement goals. The fifth level, **School Wide Improvement**, identifies high-achieving schools and recognizes the systemic, school-wide effort that is required for lasting changes in teaching and significant improvements in student learning. It provides for the remaining funds to be distributed to all certified and classified staff (who are directly involved in student learning) in each school that reaches 80% implementation or above of the targeted

teaching practices in Level 2, and/or demonstrates school-wide gains of 10% in their targeted content area using longitudinal measures of progress in the Utah Performance Accountable System for Students (U-PASS).

The following is an outline of specific information as to how WCSD intends to spend its allocation: eligibility for the performance-based compensation; criteria for awarding performance-based compensation; process and timeline elements; instruments or assessments that may be used to measure or evaluate performance; the amount of performance-based compensation that may be awarded. Due to the short time frame in preparing this proposal, the district requests the right to adjust the plan to meet the stated intent.

PLC Implementation Incentive Program

I. Eligibility for the Performance-based Compensation—All certified staff ~~and~~ classified staff involved directly with instruction (as described in II.E.b.) in WCSD schools will be eligible for at least one level of this incentive program.

Deleted: (

II. Criteria for Awarding the Performance-based Compensation

A. Level 1 Collaboration—Each PLC team of certified educators must complete the following tasks:

1. Analyze available student achievement data for their content area, set a team SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, timely) goal for student learning in the coming year, propose a plan for reaching that goal, and indicate their intent to apply for the PLC implementation incentive (September, 2008).
2. Collaboratively create (or select, if one already exists), administer, and submit at least one common assessment per grading period, aligned with the

state core, which will be used to formatively assess progress toward their team goals.

3. Periodically (at least once per grading period) analyze student work. This analysis is to include common assessments and other forms of assessment to identify students' needs, differentiate instruction, design classroom/school interventions based on those needs, and identify effective teaching practices to improve student achievement.
4. Submit samples of assessment data or student work—along with the Analysis of Student Work protocol (see Appendix)—each grading period, to their principal for feedback and formative review, using the PLC Rubric (see Appendix).
5. Using the Level 1 Team Collaboration Form (see Appendix) submit all of the above evidence to the district PLC Review Committee and score at least 80% (16 out of 20) on the PLC Rubric by the end of the school year.

B. Level 2 Implementation of Instructional Practices—Using an approved observation checklist and the process described in their school's CSIP Proposal for Level 2 PLC Incentives: Individual Implementation of Targeted Instructional Practices (see Appendix) each participating educator must:

1. Receive training (past or on-going) in the basic concepts and skills to be measured.
2. Demonstrate at least 80% implementation of the targeted teaching practices during the first semester, increasing to at least 90% by the second semester.

3. Submit evidence derived from a series of at least 10 classroom observations per semester, including at least 4 summative observations from the principal and district specialist/coordinator, using the approved scoring tool (see Appendix for a sample scoring tool—Math Classroom Audit Form).

C. Level 3 Student Achievement—Each PLC team of educators must:

1. Work to implement a viable, district-approved, pre- and post-assessment for their content area to measure gains in student achievement.
2. Use those assessment tools to demonstrate combined student achievement gains in their targeted learning outcomes.
 - a. Teams that reach at least the medium longitudinal measure of progress in the U-PASS accountability system and demonstrate the equivalent of a 10% increase in U-PASS points from the previous year in the team's targeted content area (based on the team's identified SMART goal) will receive the full Level 2 stipend.
 - b. Teams that reach at least the medium longitudinal measure of progress in the U-PASS accountability system and demonstrate gains of at least 3% but less than 10% will receive a corresponding, pro-rated amount of the incentive.

D. Level 4 Leadership

1. Each team leader will receive additional compensation when their team successfully reaches the Level 1 criteria.

2. Each school's instructional leader, along with assistant principals and staff developers, will receive compensation for each of the PLC teams in their school that successfully reach the Level 1 and Level 3 criteria.

E. Level 5 School Wide Improvement

1. Any remaining funds will be distributed to the schools that have at least 80% participation from certified staff. This funding will be divided into two segments and distributed as follows:
 - a. Segment 1—Instructional Bonus. For each school having at least 80% of their teachers receive a Level 2 incentive in the final semester, each participating certified employee in that school will receive a full share of this segment.
 - b. Segment 2—Student Achievement Bonus. Each participating certified employee and each classified employee who is directly involved with instruction, in each of these schools that reaches at least the medium longitudinal measure of progress in the U-PASS accountability system and demonstrates the equivalent of a 10% increase in U-PASS points from the previous year's targeted content area (based on the school's identified SMART goal) will receive a full share of this segment.
2. Schools that reach at least the medium longitudinal measure of progress in the U-PASS accountability system and demonstrate gains of at least 3% but less than 10% will receive a corresponding, pro-rated share of this segment.

III. Process and Timeline Elements

A. Level 1 Team Collaboration

1. PLC teams will formally indicate their intention to pursue the incentive on the Critical Questions for Team Consideration: Pre-assessment Survey (see Appendix) and complete their digital CSIP development (September, 2008).
2. Teams will meet on a regular basis throughout the year to collaborate on curriculum, assessment and interventions.
3. Teams will submit their collaborative work to their school instructional leader for formative review and feedback (each grading period) using the PLC Rubric.
4. Teams will submit their final evidence of the above work and an evaluation of their own development as a PLC team using the PLC Rubric to the WCSD professional development department (May, 2009).
5. The PLC Review Committee, consisting of teachers, administrators, and parent/community members, will review the applications and award the incentives. No administrator or teacher will review applications from their own school (June, 2009).

B. Level 2 Implementation of Instructional Practices

1. Principals will lead their schools in identifying a goal for student learning, targeting specific teaching practices that will bring about those goals, and in developing a CSIP Proposal for Level 2 Incentives in conjunction with the appropriate district specialist/coordinator (August, 2008).
2. Participating schools must submit the CSIP Proposal for Level 2 Incentives for approval by the Professional Development Advisory Panel (September 1, 2008), which will address the following questions:

- a. How does the incentive address areas of high student need based on district and school goals for student learning?
 - b. How does the incentive target and clearly describe specific, research-based instructional practices that will highly impact student learning in this area?
 - c. What is your plan for training, supporting, and assessing the implementation of these desired practices?
 - d. Which teachers intend to participate?
 - e. How will the plan be carried out with the available staff and resources?
What hidden costs (money and time) might be associated with the plan and where will those resources be drawn from?
 - f. How will you evaluate the success of your plan?
3. The building principal, in cooperation with appropriate district coordinators/specialists, will be responsible for creating their school's plan for observing and documenting effective implementation of the targeted instructional practices. This observation plan will include:
- a. Observation checklist. Each participating school must select one of the observation scoring tools/checklists (see samples in Appendix) approved by the Professional Development Advisory Panel for measuring specific teaching practices that will improve student achievement. Principals will receive training in the use of the chosen observational protocol.

b. At least 20 formative and summative classroom observations for each participating teacher.

i. Summative Observations—At least eight summative observations per year to summatively score and determine if the teacher has reached the required level of implementation for that semester's incentive. At least four must be completed each semester.

(1) At least two of the four summative observations per semester must be conducted by a district specialist/coordinator not assigned to that school.

(2) At least two observations per semester must be conducted by the principal. The principal's observations may be done during a random visit or professional evaluation conference as per district policy #1432.

ii. Formative Observations—These visits will be used for the teacher to gain non-evaluative feedback to prepare for their summative observations from the principal/specialist.

Observations done by staff developers will only be used formatively, not as a part of the final, summative scoring.

(1) Formative observations may include self-assessment, peer-observation, adapted Learning Walks, or other ways of observing and assessing implementation of

teaching practices. (Schools are encouraged to include outside input from parents, community members, educators from other schools, and district staff as well.)

- (2) The teacher is responsible for providing artifacts/physical evidence of targeted teaching practices not observed during observation visits.

- c. Each participating school's CSIP will include a Level 2 PLC Incentive: Statement of Intent (see Appendix) signed by each teacher who intends to pursue the Level 2 incentive, and indicating their training needs in that area. These signatures will be used to calculate the number of total participants' district-wide. Yearly incentive amounts will then be adjusted to match the number of participating teachers across the district.
- d. District specialists/coordinators may also submit proposals to target implementation of key teaching practices which further district and school goals, using the CSIP Proposal for Level 2 Incentives. Planning for these proposals must be done in conjunction with building principals and incorporated into each participating school's CSIP. These proposals must be submitted to the Professional Development Advisory Panel for approval.
- e. Implementation stipends will be paid in installments at the end of each semester for each teacher who demonstrates the required levels of

implementation. Summative scores for implementation observations, along with a record of all formative observations, must be sent to the WCSD professional development department within two weeks following the last day of each grading period, using the Level 2 PLC Incentive: Individual Implementation of Targeted Instructional Practices form (see Appendix).

- f. Principals will submit the final School Leadership Team: PLC Implementation Summary (see Appendix) to the Professional Development Advisory Panel (June 15, 2009).

C. Level 3 Student Achievement

1. PLC Teams will analyze previous student achievement data, set goals for improvement, and indicate which assessment tools they will use to measure their targeted gains in the coming year (September, 2008).
2. Teams will implement a viable pre- and post-assessment to measure gains in student achievement as follows:
 - a. Where available, teams may use existing criterion-referenced tests (CRT) or district-approved benchmark assessments.
 - b. Teams in areas that do not currently have CRT or benchmark assessments are responsible for creating/selecting and agreeing upon such assessments/benchmarks, at a district-wide PLC level, and creating a scoring system equivalent to the U-PASS progress value table. These proposed tools must then be submitted to the district Director of Assessment for approval, using the form—Level 3 Student

Achievement Incentive for Teams Without Established CRTs

(October, 2008).

- c. Teams will use those assessment tools to demonstrate combined student achievement gains in their targeted learning outcomes. Teams will submit a final Team Analysis and Summary of their student achievement data, along with a copy of their selected benchmark assessment tools (May, 2009).

D. Level 4 Leadership

1. PLC teams will indicate who their team leader is on the Critical Questions for Team Consideration: Pre-assessment Survey (September, 2008).
2. Principals will lead their school in analyzing data, setting goals, creating a comprehensive plan for school improvement, and evaluating the school's progress toward student achievement goals and improved teaching practices.
3. Principals and staff developers will assess and support the progress of each PLC team throughout the year.
4. Principals and staff developers of teams that reach the Level 1 and/or Level 3 criteria will receive a Level 4 stipend (Summer, 2009).

E. Level 5 School Wide Improvement

1. Each school or site-level PLC that wishes to be eligible for the school-wide bonuses must have all interested staff (certified and classified) sign a Level 2 PLC Incentive: Statement of Intent for the above activities in the upcoming year (September, 2008).

2. In the event that there are available funds remaining from Levels 1-4, the Professional Development Advisory Panel will award Level 5 bonuses to qualifying schools according to criteria described in II.E.b (Summer, 2009).
3. Principals will submit the final School Leadership Team: PLC Implementation Summary to the Professional Development Advisory Panel (June 15, 2009).

IV. Instruments and Assessments that will be used to Measure or Evaluate Performance

A. PLC Incentive

1. Level 1 Team Collaboration
 - a. Critical Questions for Team Consideration: Pre-assessment survey
 - b. Digital CSIP tool (includes SMART goals, data analysis and team plan)
 - c. PLC Rubric with attached artifacts/evidence
 - d. Analysis of Student Work/Data
 - e. Level 1 Team Collaboration Form
2. Level 2 Implementation of Instructional Practices
 - a. Observation checklists, including Math Classroom Audit Form (see Appendix), Reading Classroom Audit, Writing Classroom Audit, and others as approved by the Professional Development Advisory Panel
 - b. CSIP Proposal for Level 2 PLC Incentives
 - c. Level 2 PLC Incentive: Individual Implementation of Targeted Practices
 - d. School Leadership Team: PLC Implementation Summary
3. Level 3 Student Achievement Measures

- a. Pre- and Post-Assessments of Student Achievement (CRT's, district-approved benchmark assessments)
 - b. U-PASS Accountability System—longitudinal measures and point system.
 - c. Level 3 Student Achievement Incentive for Teams Without Established CRT's
4. Level 5 School Wide Improvement
- a. Comprehensive School Improvement Plan/Accreditation Plan (CSIP) including:
 - i. SMART goals and student achievement measurement tools
 - ii. CSIP Proposal for Level 2 PLC Incentives
 - iii. Level 2 PLC Incentive: Statement of Intent with staff signatures
 - iv. School Leadership Team: PLC Implementation Summary with final data and analysis of student achievement gains

B. Program Evaluation

1. The Professional Development Advisory Panel, consisting of representatives from teachers, principals, staff developers, parent organizations, and district office staff, will meet at least monthly to manage and assess the program and make adjustments as needed.
2. The Curriculum and Instruction Department will meet monthly to coordinate program support and assessment.

3. A PLC Incentive Year-end Survey will be sent to participating teachers, administrators, and community council/parent organization members to assess overall satisfaction and elicit recommendations for improvement (May, 2009).
4. A program evaluation report will be submitted to the WCSD School Board and the Utah State Office Education (July 1, 2009).

V. Performance-based compensation amounts

A. Participating educators may receive a combination of the following:

1. Level 1 Collaboration—\$500 per certified educator on each qualifying PLC team
2. Level 2 Implementation of Instructional Practices—\$600 per certified educator
3. Level 3 Student Achievement—\$200 per certified educator on each qualifying PLC team (with a pro-rated stipend available for gains between 5-9%).
4. Level 4 Leadership
 - a. Team Leaders—\$100 per designated Team-Leader for each team that meets the Level 1 requirements
 - b. Principals, Vice Principals, Staff Developers (not to exceed \$1400 before Level 5 bonuses)
 - i. \$100 per instructional leader for each PLC team at their site that meets the Level 1 requirements

- ii. \$100 per instructional leader for each PLC team at their site that meets the Level 3 requirements
- 5. Level 5 School Wide Improvement—Any remaining funds will be divided into two equal segments and distributed as follows:
 - a. Segment 1—In each school that reached at least 80% school-wide implementation of their targeted instructional practices (see Level 2), an equal proportion of this segment will be distributed to each certified employee who signed that school’s Statement of Support and participated fully as agreed.
 - b. Segment 2—In each school that attained combined school-wide student achievement gains in the targeted learning outcomes for their school SMART goal of 10% or above (with pro-rated stipend available for members of those schools who reached gain scores of between 5-9%), an equal proportion of this segment will be distributed to each certified and classified employee (who are directly involved in instruction) who signed that school’s Statement of Intent and participated fully as agreed.
- 6. The Professional Development Advisory Panel will adjust Level 1-4 stipend amounts based on number of participants, to ensure that Level 5 bonuses shall not exceed double the total amount possible for any individual from Level 1-4 stipends.

VI. Estimated program costs—\$2,665,152.31

- A. Teacher and Leadership Stipends—\$2,387,066.88

1. Teacher Stipends—\$2,143,764.48
 - a. \$1300 per teacher x 1342 certified educators—\$1,744,600.00
 - b. FICA (\$139,568.00) and Retirement (\$259,596.48)—\$399,164.48
 2. Leadership Stipends—\$243,302.40
 - a. Team Leaders—\$36,864.00
 - i. \$100 per team leader x 300 teams—\$30,000
 - ii. FICA (\$13,440.00) and Retirement (\$4,464.00)—\$6,864.00
 - b. Principals and Staff Developers—\$206,438.40
 - i. \$1400 x 120 Principals/Staff Developers—\$168,000.00
 - ii. FICA (\$6,608.00) and Retirement (\$24,998.40)—\$38,438.40
 3. In the event that the total amount awarded by the state differs from current projections, incentive amounts will be adjusted proportionately.
- B. Training Costs—\$11,500
1. 1 day training event for principals and staff developers—\$150 stipend
 2. \$150 stipend x 70 participants + \$1000 for training materials—\$11,500
- C. Performance measurements—\$267,585.43
1. PLC Application Review Panel
 - a. 240 hrs of district extra duty pay (\$17.80/hr + FICA and Retirement)—\$5249.43
 2. Four Instructional/Curriculum Specialists (to provide up to 7200 hrs of quality classroom observations) and mileage:
 - a. Salary \$45,000 * 4—\$180,000
 - b. FICA (\$14,400.00) and Retirement (\$26,784.00)—\$41,184.00

c. Insurance—\$40,000

d. Mileage—100 miles/month x 9 months x 4 specialists x \$.32 = \$1,152

D. Indirect Costs—\$31,846.37

1. $\$2,653,864.31 \times 1.2$ (state indirect cost rate)—\$31,846.37

Appendix

WCSD PLC Implementation Incentive Tools

Analysis of Student Work

PLC Rubric

Level 1 Team Collaboration Form

CSIP Proposal for Level 2 Incentives: Individual Implementation of Targeted Instructional Practices

Math Classroom Audit

Critical Questions for Team Consideration: Pre-assessment Survey

Level 2 PLC Incentive: Individual Implementation of Targeted Practices

School Leadership Team: PLC Implementation Summary

Level 3 Student Achievement Incentive for Teams Without Established CRT's

Level 2 PLC Incentive: Statement of Intent





PLC Rubric

FOCUS AREA	4 - FULLY EMBEDDED	3 - PARTIAL	2 - EMERGING	1- NOT EMBEDDED
<p>COLLABORATION</p> <p>Key Question: “What does effective collaboration look like for my team?”</p> <p>Directions: Beginning with the “4-Fully Embedded” column, mark each of the descriptors that accurately describes the culture of your team. If you are unable to mark all of the descriptors in a column, move RIGHT to the next column until you are able to mark each descriptor.</p> <p>Possible Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample agendas • 	<p>Our team meets each week to collaborate.</p> <p>Our collaboration efforts consistently focus specifically on at least one aspect of the PLC cycle (see attached)</p> <p>Each member of our team attends and contributes to all of our collaboration meetings</p> <p>Each member of our team has opportunity to express their thoughts with their input being respected and valued.</p> <p>We have set clear, measurable goals for our collaborative efforts that directly correlate with the school’s collaborative mission, vision, goals and CSIP</p>	<p>Our team meets twice per month.</p> <p>The focus of our meetings are generally about one of the 4 collaborative areas though we sometimes end up talking about other things.</p> <p>Each member of our team attends our collaboration meetings most of the time.</p> <p>We receive some input from most members of our team during the meeting</p> <p>We have goals, though not necessarily measurable, for our collaborative efforts that directly correlate with the school’s collaborative mission, vision, goals and CSIP</p>	<p>Our team meets once per month.</p> <p>Our collaboration meetings resemble a team meeting with the focus being on team business and scheduling with some discussion about student learning.</p> <p>When we do manage to meet, our members attend sporadically.</p> <p>Discussions in our meetings tend to be dominated by one or two people</p> <p>We have no written goals but have a clear understanding as to the direction we are going in regards to collaboration and our school’s CSIP.</p>	<p>We rarely meet as a team</p> <p>When we do meet, we have little to no focus for our team meetings.</p> <p>We rarely meet as a team and never get our whole team to attend.</p> <p>When we do meet as a team, one person talks while the rest listen.</p> <p>We have little or no direction during our meetings with limited purpose</p>

FOCUS AREA	4 - FULLY EMBEDDED	3 - PARTIAL	2 - EMERGING	1- NOT EMBEDDED
<p>INTERVENTIONS</p> <p>Key Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will we do when they don't get it? • What will we do with those who have already got it? <p>Directions: Beginning with the "4-Fully Embedded" column, mark each of the descriptors that accurately describes the culture of your team. If you are unable to mark all of the descriptors in a column, move RIGHT to the next column until you are able to mark each descriptor.</p> <p>Possible Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of SW • Pyramid of Interventions • Case Studies 	<p>As a team, we have an immediate response plan in place for students who do not demonstrate proficiency on a set standard that is shown to demonstrate success.</p> <p>Our response plan is required of all students who do not meet a given standard.</p> <p>Our team's intervention plan is fully integrated into our school-wide system of student support.</p> <p>We meet as a team and discuss the progress of each student who has not met the standards.</p> <p>Every member of our team takes part in our intervention plan</p> <p>Our intervention plan consistently demonstrates success for all students.</p>	<p>As a team, we have an occasional response plan in place for students who do not demonstrate proficiency on a set standard.</p> <p>Our response plan is optional for students to attend.</p> <p>Our team's intervention plan is only loosely connected to any school-wide systems of student support</p> <p>We meet and discuss most of the students who are struggling in our classes.</p> <p>Most members of our team take part in our intervention plan.</p> <p>Our intervention plan is successful for most students</p>	<p>Some teachers in our team have sporadic response plans in place for students who do not demonstrate proficiency on a set standard.</p> <p>We have no formal team response for students who have not met a standard although some teachers are offering extra assistance.</p> <p>Our team's intervention plan has no clear connection to our school-wide intervention systems.</p> <p>We rarely talk about struggling students nor interventions as a team.</p> <p>Some members of our team are offering interventions for struggling students.</p> <p>Any interventions are up to the student if he/she learns or not.</p>	<p>As a team, we have no response in place for students who aren't "getting it". If the student doesn't learn it, it's their own fault.</p> <p>We have no teamal response in place for students who aren't "getting it".</p> <p>Our intervention plan, if it exists, is sometimes as odds with our school-wide plan.</p> <p>We do not talk about struggling students nor interventions as a team.</p> <p>We have no interventions in place.</p> <p>"If they don't get it the first time, it's just too bad."</p>

FOCUS AREA	4 - FULLY EMBEDDED	3 - PARTIAL	2 - EMERGING	1- NOT EMBEDDED
<p>COMMON ASSESSMENT</p> <p>“What evidence will we accept that they have learned it?”</p> <p>Directions: Beginning with the “4-Fully Embedded” column, mark each of the descriptors that accurately describes the culture of your team. If you are unable to mark all of the descriptors in a column, move RIGHT to the next column until you are able to mark each descriptor.</p> <p>Possible Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment tools • Analysis of Student Work • Yearly Data Analysis 	<p>As a team, we have numerous effective common assessments that are routinely used by every member of the team and scored consistently.</p> <p>Our common assessment results are routinely shared and reviewed as a team.</p> <p>We routinely use the results of our common assessments to share teaching strategies and make effective changes to improve student learning.</p> <p>Our common assessments are constantly reviewed and adjusted to insure effective student learning of core standards.</p>	<p>We have a few common assessments that are used by most members of our team. We aren’t sure if our scoring is consistent.</p> <p>We share results when we get them but rarely look at them after that.</p> <p>We look at the results of our common assessments and occasionally make adjustments to our teaching strategies.</p> <p>Our common assessments are reviewed occasionally and generally target core standards.</p>	<p>We have thought about common assessments and believe they could be useful to student learning. There is a wide range of scoring practices and expectations.</p> <p>We talk about assessment but rarely share results within our team.</p> <p>We compare scores within our team on similar assessments we administer.</p> <p>We are beginning to develop common assessments.</p>	<p>We give our own assessments that are not the same as other teachers in the same subject .</p> <p>We work individually on our own assessments.</p> <p>We look at our own assessment results and use them only for grading purposes.</p> <p>We use the same assessment tools we have used for years and have never reviewed it</p>

FOCUS AREA	4 - FULLY EMBEDDED	3 - PARTIAL	2 - EMERGING	1- NOT EMBEDDED
<p>USING AVAILABLE DATA</p> <p>Key Question: “What evidence will we accept that they have learned it?”</p> <p>Directions: Beginning with the “4-Fully Embedded” column, mark each of the descriptors that accurately describes the culture of your team. If you are unable to mark all of the descriptors in a column, move RIGHT to the next column until you are able to mark each descriptor.</p> <p>Possible Evidence (Digital CSIP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMART goals • Pre- and post-assessment data • Data summary and conclusions 	<p>As a team, we use the data we receive from our common assessments, BSCT, CRT’s, and other forms of assessments to insure student learning.</p> <p>As a team, we frequently review our common assessment, BSCT, CRT’s and other forms of assessment .</p> <p>Each member of our team can identify areas in which our students struggled as well as performed well based on available data.</p> <p>As a team, we use yearly pre- and post-benchmark assessments to measure our team’s improvement and plan for the coming year.</p>	<p>Our team reviews the data we receive from numerous assessments to insure student learning although some members are more committed than others.</p> <p>Our team reviews our common assessments, BSCT, CRT’s and other forms of assessment on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>Our team has identified the specific strengths and weaknesses in our instruction.</p> <p>We have benchmark assessments to pre- and post-assess our students but do not yet use them to inform our team efforts.</p>	<p>Some members of our team review data received from assessments.</p> <p>Some members of our team sporadically look at the data from assessments.</p> <p>Some members of our team are aware of general strengths and weaknesses in our instruction.</p> <p>We have begun developing some tools to use as benchmark assessments, but they are not usable yet</p>	<p>We do not use data from any assessments in our team.</p> <p>We never review data from any assessment in our team.</p> <p>Data is not used to impact our instruction nor student learning.</p> <p>We have talked about benchmark assessments, but have not started making any.</p>

FOCUS AREA	4 - FULLY EMBEDDED	3 - PARTIAL	2 - EMERGING	1- NOT EMBEDDED
<p>STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>“What exactly do we want students to learn?”</p> <p>Directions: Beginning with the “4-Fully Embedded” column, mark each of the descriptors that accurately describes the culture of your team. If you are unable to mark all of the descriptors in a column, move RIGHT to the next column until you are able to mark each descriptor</p> <p>Possible Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority standards • Curriculum Map 	<p>Each member of our team aligns their instruction directly with the state standards and objectives for each course.</p> <p>Each member of our team aligns their assessment procedures based on the state standards and objectives for each course.</p> <p>As a team, we each understand, review and prioritize the state standards and objectives. We effectively communicate them to students and their parents.</p> <p>We have agreed upon the best sequence for teaching the standards and have created a yearly map for each content area, including common assessments and key instructional activities.</p> <p>We have checked our curriculum map in each area to help students build on previous courses/grades and prepare students for the next level.</p>	<p>Some members of our team have aligned their instruction with the state standards and objectives.</p> <p>Some members of our team align their assessment procedures with the state standards and objectives.</p> <p>Most members of our team, have reviewed and understand the state standards and objectives.</p> <p>We have a general agreement about the sequence of instruction, and coordinate common assessments.</p> <p>We have aligned our curriculum in some areas to help students build on previous courses/grades and prepare for the next level.</p>	<p>Our team has some members who have reviewed the state standards and objectives.</p> <p>Our team assesses student learning based loosely on state standards and objectives.</p> <p>Individual members of our team have reviewed the state standards and objectives.</p> <p>We have a general agreement about the sequence of instruction, but it is not spelled out anywhere.</p> <p>We kind of know what students should know in previous and following years, but we do not discuss it specifically as a team.</p>	<p>We do not use the state standards and objectives to guide our instruction.</p> <p>We do not use the state standards and objectives on our assessments.</p> <p>What is a standard and objective and where is it found?</p> <p>Each of us teaches what we want, when we want to.</p> <p>We do not know what students are expected to know in previous or following years in our content area.</p>

Thanks to Bob Sonju for letting us adapt and build on his excellent rubric he introduced while VP at PVHS.

Level 1 Team Collaboration Form

Pre-Assess team with PLC rubric and indicate intent to apply for collaboration incentive (September, 2008)

Analyze available student achievement data for their content area (September 2008)

Set a team SMART goal for student learning in the coming year (September, 2008)

/ Collaboratively create (or select from existing assessments), administer, and submit at least one common assessment per grading period, aligned with the state core, which will be used to formatively assess progress toward their team goals

/ Periodically, (at least once per grading period) analyze student work (from common assessments and other forms of assessment) to identify students' needs, differentiate instruction, design classroom/school interventions based on those needs, and identify effective teaching practices to improve student achievement. Keep samples of assessment data or student work, along with the Analysis of Student Work protocol to submit as evidence of your work.

/ Submit completed PLC work each grading period to the building principal for feedback and formative review, using the PLC rubric.

Submit all of the above evidence to the district PLC Review Panel and score at least 80% (16 out of 20) or above on the PLC rubric (May, 2008).

CSIP Proposal for Level 2 PLC Incentives:
Individual Implementation of Targeted Instructional Practices
(Due September 1, 2008)

School: _____ Principal: _____ District _____
Specialist/Coordinator: _____

Criteria #1: Do the targeted teaching practices directly address areas of high student need specified in your CSIP and/or district CUSAP goals for student learning?

- School SMART Goal for Student Learning:

Criteria #2: Does the incentive target and clearly describe specific, research-based instructional practices that will highly impact student learning in this area?

- What instructional model have you chosen to implement to help you reach this goal?
Select from the following:

☐ Elementary Math ☐ Elementary Writing
☐ Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP)
☐ Differentiated Instruction ☐ Classroom Instruction that Works
☐ Understanding by Design ☐ Cooperative Learning

- Other? _____ (Please attach the observational tool and reliable evidence/research that demonstrates the impact of these targeted practices on student achievement)

Criteria #3: Is there a coherent plan for supporting and assessing the implementation of the desired practices in student achievement?

- Please attach your plan for training teachers prior to and/or during implementation of the targeted teaching practices
- Please attach your plan for assessing implementation by teams of the targeted instructional practices based on the following rules:
 - a. Each teacher must have at least 20 classroom observations using the approved

scoring tool.

- b. At least 4 summative observations per semester must be used to determine if each teacher has reached the required implementation level (At least 80% during the first semester, increasing to at least 90% by the final grading period).
 - i. At least two of these observations per semester must be from a district specialist not assigned to that school.
 - ii. At least two of these observations per semester must be from the principal. (Note: These may be done during a random visit or professional evaluation conference under current district policy--see policy# 1432).
 - iii. In addition, the teacher may also choose to include up to 2 observations per semester from the staff developer.
- c. Observations done by staff developers will only be used formatively, not as a part of the final, summative scoring, unless the teacher chooses to include them as such.
- d. Other observations may include learning walks, self-assessment, and peer observation. (Note: Schools are encouraged to include input from parents, community members, other schools, and district staff during learning walks to increase objectivity, benefit from outside perspectives, and increase awareness.)

Criteria #4: Can the plan be carried out with the available staff and resources? What other hidden costs (money and time) might be associated with the plan and where will those resources be drawn from?

- Estimated time commitments:
 - Administrator
 - District Specialist
 - Participating Teachers
 - Staff Developer
- Please submit a budget for any additional costs associated with the training, implementation, and assessment of these targeted teaching practices.

Criteria #5: Does the incentive include a clear plan for program evaluation? How will your school systematically evaluate and improve each of the following?

- Participating teachers response to training and observations (Did they like it?)
- New skills and knowledge learned (What did they learn?)
- Implementation of new teaching practices (How much did teaching actually improve?)
- Reliability and rigor of observation tool and scoring (How accurate were our assessments of implementation?)
- Organizational structure and support (How well does our school support the development of these new teaching practices?)
- Impact on student learning and student affect (How did this help students?)

Statement of Administrative Support:

- I believe the above plan for supporting and assessing the implementation of these instructional practices directly supports our school goals for student learning.
- I have considered the time and effort necessary to complete these observations and am willing to oversee the training, evaluation, and reporting of these results.
- All results will be reported accurately and objectively to the best of my ability.

Participating Principal's Signature:

Statement of Support from District Specialist/Coordinator:

- The above plan and accompanying tools for supporting and assessing the implementation of these instructional practices is aligned with my best understanding of best practices in instruction and professional development.
- I have considered the time and effort necessary to complete these observations and am willing and able to provide site visits, observations, and training and support as indicated the above plan.
- All results will be reported accurately and objectively to the best of my ability.

Participating District Specialist/Coordinator's Signature:

Math Classroom Audit
 Third Trimester Incentive Bonus Report
 30 possibilities for each Classroom Audit times the ten visits = 300
 (85% First Trimester/90% Second Trimester/90% Third Trimester)

Name:
 School:

Classroom Environment (5 possibilities for each Classroom Audit times ten visits=50)

Students are seated so that every child can easily see instruction	
A variety of seating is evident; such as carpet, desks, or tables	
Math "Word Wall with current math terminology	
Desks are arranged so that there is easy access to cooperative learning	
Student work is prominently displayed in the classroom and hall.	
SUB-TOTAL	

General Teacher Behaviors (11 possibilities for each Classroom Audit times ten visits=110)

Teachers begins with Number Sense Activity	
Teach follows basic outline of lesson from the Teacher Resource File	
Use of Real-Math or Math from Many Cultures Book (when appropriate)	
Whole group discussion using overhead transparencies	
Teacher is following the pacing sequence and is at the appropriate place	
The teacher calls on a mix of students to answer	
Teacher uses questions that involve higher order thinking skills	
Teacher evokes reasoning as to students answers along with sharing of math strategies	
Teacher encourages all students to participate	
Teacher uses different strategies to engage students	
Teacher administers common assessments and collects data for PLC	
SUB-TOTAL	

Student Work/Behavior (8 possibilities for each Classroom Audit times ten visits=80)

Students share answers in whole group discussion	
Students use manipulatives or drawings to show or explain work	
Students work in whole groups	
Students work in small groups	
Students work individually	
Students do practice pages from student consumable, teacher directed	
Students record thought from Assessing the Lesson in a journal	
All students are engaged in work	
SUB-TOTAL	

Material used for teaching (6 possibilities for each Classroom Audit times ten visits=60)

Overhead transparencies of Discussion Book	
Real-world Math Books are used	
Hands-on materials from Teacher Resource Kit and/or manipulatives	
Math Word Wall	
Number Sense starter/ Student book volume 1 or volume 2	
Topic of discussion from Teacher Resource File	
SUB-TOTAL	
TOTAL	

Baseline Test: 1st Year End Test: 2nd Year End Test:

Critical Questions for Team Consideration: Pre-Assessment Questionnaire
(Due by September 1, 2008)

School: _____

Team Name (grade level/content area): _____

Team Leader: _____

Y / N I have reviewed the PLC rubric and criteria for the Level 1 Collaboration Incentive.

Y / N I and my team wish to be considered for the Level 1 Collaboration Incentive

Consider the following statements in relationship to your team and indicate the level to which the statement is descriptive of your team:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is not
true of our
team

This is true of
some but not
all of the team

Uncertain

Our team has
addressed this issue

We have
consensus and act
in accordance with
our consensus

1. ____ Each member of our team is clear on the intended outcomes of our course in general as well as the specific outcomes of each unit.
2. ____ We have aligned the outcomes of our course to state goals and to high stakes tests such as the CRT's, UBSCT, _____, _____
3. ____ We have identified the prerequisite knowledge and skills needed to master the intended outcomes of the course of unit.
4. ____ We have identified strategies and created instruments to assess whether students have the prerequisite knowledge and skills.
5. ____ We have agreed on how to best sequence the content of the course to help students achieve the intended outcomes.
6. ____ We have agreed on the criteria we will use in judging the quality of student work in key areas of our course such as writing, speaking and projects.

7. _____ We have taught students the criteria we will use in judging the quality of their work and have provided them with examples.
8. _____ We have developed formative assessments that help us identify strengths and weaknesses of individual students.
9. _____ We have developed summative assessments that help us assess the strengths and weaknesses of our program.
10. _____ We have established the proficiency level we want all students to achieve on our summative assessments.
11. _____ We have identified content and/or topics that can be eliminated so we can devote more time to essential curriculum.
12. _____ We have analyzed student achievement data and established measurable team goals that we are working together to achieve.
13. _____ We have identified team norms or protocols to guide us in working together.
14. _____ We adhere to our team norms.
15. _____ We are continually looking for new ways to help students achieve at higher levels.

Comments/Suggestions/Needs:

Level 2 PLC Incentive: Individual Implementation of Targeted Instructional Practices

Grading Period	Date of Observation	By Whom (Signature)	Formative/ Summative?	Point Score	Notes
First Semester					
Total Visits (formative and summative)/Points (summative only)					Due Jan 10 th , 2009
Second Semester					
Total Visits (formative and summative)/Points (summative only)					Due May 15 th , 2009

Level 2 PLC Incentive: Individual Implementation of Targeted Instructional Practices

Each teacher must have at least 20 classroom observations using the approved scoring tool and the following guidelines:

1. At least 4 summative observations per semester must be used to determine if each teacher has reached the required implementation level (At least 80% during the first semester, increasing to at least 90% by the final grading period).
 - a. At least two of these observations per semester must be from a district specialist not assigned to that school.
 - b. At least two of these observations per semester must be from the principal. (Note: These may be done during a random visit or professional evaluation conference under current district policy--see policy# 1432).
 - c. In addition, the teacher may also choose to include up to 2 observations per semester from the staff developer.
2. Observations done by staff developers will only be used formatively, not as a part of the final, summative scoring, unless the teacher chooses to include them as such.
3. Other observations may include learning walks, self-assessment, and peer observation. (Note: Schools are encouraged to include input from parents, community members, other schools, and district staff during learning walks to increase objectivity, benefit from outside perspectives, and increase awareness.)

Other than dates and signatures documenting that they took place, the scores and actual evidence from formative observations (staff developer, peer coach, etc) will be recorded and kept by the teacher. Dates and signatures documenting the formative visits, along with evidence and scores from summative observations (principal, district specialist/coordinator) will be recorded and kept by the building administrator.

First semester scores must be finalized and turned in by January 10th for 1st semester, and by May 10th for 2nd semester using the attached tool.

School Leadership Team: PLC Implementation Summary

Level 1: Scores for each team on PLC rubric

[illegible]

Level 2: Targeted Teaching Practices: _____

Part a—What training have we provided this semester on the targeted teaching practices?

Part b—Formative/Summative Observations (Types/Scores)

[illegible]

Level 3: Student achievement Indicators

How many of your teams are on track to receive the level 3 bonus?

Team	Description of Pre- and Post-Assessments tool	Approved by Director of Assessment?	Goal	Current Reality

Level 4—Leadership, Level 5—School Wide Improvement, and Program Evaluation

How are you doing overall? How are we doing in supporting you?

What is working?	What needs work?
Next Steps	Needed Support/Resources

Other Comments/Suggestions?

Level 3 Student Achievement Incentive for Teams Without Established CRT's
(\$200)

Any team wishing to apply for a Level 3: Student Achievement incentive must create and administer benchmark assessments that can be equated to the UPASS progress value table, and demonstrate a 5% increase in progress value points from the previous year. Many teams will be able to use existing CRT's and data, but for those who cannot, the following process is necessary to be eligible for this incentive:

Step 1:

- a. Identify what levels of achievement would be equivalent to 1a,1b (Far Below Standard), 2a,2b (Approaching Standard), 3 (Meeting Standard), and 4 (Exceeding Standard) for where students should be at the beginning and end of the course.
- b. Create or find a reliable, valid pre-assessment of those standards and submit it to the WCSD Director of Assessment no later than September 15, 2008. Any tools that are not acceptable will receive feedback and teams may revise up to October 15, 2008.

Step 2:

Field test and score the pre-assessment of those standards, then group students into the 6 categories. Assign points for each student as follows:

The following Progress Value Table is used for the schools without a 12th grade.

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level					
	1a	1b	2a	2b	3	4
1a	0	225	350	375	375	375
1b	0	125	225	350	375	375
2a	0	50	150	225	325	350
2b	0	0	75	175	275	325
3	0	0	0	100	200	275
4	0	0	0	0	125	225

The following Progress Value Table is used for schools with a 12th grade.

2006 (Year 1) Level	2007 (Year 2) Level					
	1a	1b	2a	2b	3	4
1a	0	200	250	300	350	375
1b	0	125	200	300	350	350
2a	0	50	150	175	325	325
2b	0	0	75	175	300	325
3	0	0	0	100	200	300
4	0	0	0	0	125	225

Determine your team's beginning score by averaging the student scores. Submit your data to the WCSD Director of Assessment by October 15, 2008. (\$100 for completing only steps 1 and 2)

Step 3:

Use the data to inform your PLC work throughout the year.

Step 4:

- a. Create (or find), administer, and score a post-assessment of those standards, then group students into the 6 categories. Assign and average scores using the same process as in step 2.
- b. Teams that reach a progress score of at least 200 will qualify for the remaining \$100 for a total of \$200 in Level 3.
- c. Submit final scores and copies of the post-assessment to the WCSD Director of Assessment no later than June 1, 2009.

Level 2 PLC Incentive: Statement of Intent

Our School Targeted Teaching Practices:

We, the staff of _____ School hereby signify that we have read and understand our school CSIP goals for improving student achievement and instruction, along with the requirements for the Level 2 PLC Incentive (Implementation of Instructional Practices), and commit our time and support to reaching these goals within the scope of our assigned roles and duties:

[illegible]

